

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, applicants appreciate the partial withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and the examiner's consideration of Group IV with Group I.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to Fig. 3, because Item 24 is correctly labeled. Item 24 is the opening in the bobbin, and reference number 22 refers to one of the gaps in the motor, seen in Fig. 2. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The objection to Item 70 in Figs. 7 and 8 has been overcome by amending the specification on page 10, line 22.

Claims 10 and 17-21 stand rejected under § 112. Claim 10 has been amended to depend from claim 2, providing antecedent basis for the movement control system, and claim 17 has been amended to remove "the other end" on line 13. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 11-13 stand rejected under § 102(e) on the basis of Souldanian '092. Applicants traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a hinge made of interlocking laminations of the stationary piece and moving piece of a motor, as in the present invention.

Souldanian discloses the lamination structure shown in Fig. 6, and an irrelevant lamination structure in Fig. 13. The laminations in Fig. 6 of the reference are separate, where the laminations in independent claims 1 and 17 interlock, as seen, for example, in Fig. 2 of the present application. For these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1, and related dependent claims 2-4, 7 and 11-13.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of '092 and WO 599. WO 599 also does not disclose a hinge made of interlocking laminations. Accordingly, this rejection is traversed for the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of '092. This rejection is traversed for the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1.

Claim 10 stands rejected under § 103 on the basis of '092 and Davis. Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1.

Claim 14 stands rejected under § 103 on the basis of '092 and Huppert. This rejection is also traversed for the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 17, 18 and 21 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of '092 and Wahl '587. Applicants traverse this rejection because neither reference, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a hinge made of interlocking laminations, as now recited in independent claim 17.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of '092, '587 and '599. This rejection is traversed for the reasons given with respect to independent claim 17.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

March 18, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
F:\Data\WP60\2206\64630\Amend A.doc